

In one embodiment described within the specification, the present invention is utilized to allow a party on the client side to select and customize certain options relating to vehicle acquisition. The database, option criteria, and various other parameters can be very large when considering that a large number of vehicles may be offered, with each one having its own unique and large set of selectable options. Thus, with the present system and method the client can provide some information to essentially narrow the field of possibilities. For example, a given make and model of an automobile can be selected. Then the system passes a limited configuration engine (in one embodiment) relevant to the chosen make and model, to the client. The limited configuration engine is then used on the client side to configure the remainder of the vehicle options. Thus, repeated exchanges between the client and the server are avoided. In addition, only the relevant limited configuration engine is passed to the client. The remainder of the information/programming resident on the server is not passed to the client as it is unnecessary in that instance and would remain unused by the client.

In other words, in at least one embodiment a given client can access a given server; provide some indication of the what is being requested; receive a limited subset of all of the available functionality; utilize that functionality on the client side; and provide the results of that functionality to the server.

Such a system is simply not taught by Puri, Christeson et al., or a combination of the two. Puri teaches a system whereby all of the information and all of the functionality is resident on the client side. The only integration with the server comes from “pushed” updates to certain pricing and availability information otherwise resident on the client side. In other words, the server simply updates the information on the client. The fact that the entirety of the functionality occurs on the client side is explicit. “Significant to the invention is the ability to perform *all* sales related functions off line.” Col. 2, lines 63-65 (Emphasis added). “The smart configurator provides an interactive *off-line* product selection dialog.” Col. 3, lines 54-55 (Emphasis added). “As discussed above, one *significant feature* of the invention is the ability of the user to operate the smart configuration off-line.” Col. 4, lines 23-25 (Empahsis added).

Thus, the Puri system has all of the functionality available on the client side, which as addressed in the present application is undesirable in some contexts. Puri only makes peripheral and optional use of anything on the server side and what is utilized is only an update to the

information already stored on the client side. “Finally, the smart configurator may *optionally* be placed on-line to check for the existence of more current pricing and SKU information at a company server.” Col. 4, lines 16-18 (Emphasis added).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated which portions of the Puri references are believed to teach certain claim elements. Specifically, in paragraph 4, the Examiner states the Puri reference teaches the Examiner designated “(b) in response to the user’s desired subset of possible products . . . downloading from the at least one server at least one client limited configuration information and limited configuration programs” at Col. 5, lines 52-53. As the Examiner will note from the cited section, the “various packaged options” are resident on the client side workstation; they are not downloaded let alone downloaded from a server in response to input from a client. Without individually addressing each of the cited passages purported to teach claimed elements specifically, the Examiner repeatedly asserts that the claimed client-server interaction is taught in Puri by a clearly client side only application. This position is simply unsupportable.

The Examiner further cites Christeson et al. to teach the use of “desired technical considerations.” The Examiner’s use of this reference for this purpose is not understood by Applicant. However, what is clear is that the reference is not particularly relevant to the present claims and fails to address the inadequacies of the Puri reference, as noted above. The Christeson et al. reference simply provides a single integrated graphical interface capable of accessing a plurality of otherwise diverse and independent databases.

Thus, neither reference alone or in combination teaches the presently claimed invention. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection and pass this case to issue.

Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Date: 5/22/02

By:



Daniel G. Chapik (Reg. No. 43,424)
Suite 1500
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
(612) 343-7955